

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 100204030-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Robert Douglas Christiansen

Confirmation No.: 7123

Application No.: 10/620,067

Examiner: Hilina S. Kassa

Filing Date: 7/14/2003

Group Art Unit: 2609

Title: Automatically configuring a raster image processor

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 3/9/2009.

☒ The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is \$540.00 (37 CFR 41.20).

☐ No Additional Fee Required.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month
\$130

☐ 2nd Month
\$490

☐ 3rd Month
\$1110

☐ 4th Month
\$1730

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 540. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Douglas Christiansen

By /Michael Dryja/

Michael Dryja

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 39,662

Date : 5/3/2009

Telephone : (425) 427-5094

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First named Applicant: Robert Douglas Christiansen	Group Art Unit: 2609
Application No.: 10/620,067 (CONF 7123)	
Filed: 7/14/2003	
Title: Automatically Configuring a Raster Image Processor	Examiner: Hilina S. Kassa
Attorney Docket No.: 100204030-1	

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF

This Appeal Brief is organized in accordance with the requirements set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c).

Real party in interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

Related appeals and interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences to the present patent application.

Status of claims

Claims 1-22 were filed in the present patent application. Of these claims, claims 3, 10, and 17 were amended during prosecution. The rejection of all the pending claims 1-22 is subject to this appeal.

Status of amendments

None of the claims were amended in the final office action response of February 9, 2009, which was responsive to the final office action of December 8, 2008. The Examiner did indicate in the advisory action of February 27, 2009, that “the proposed amendments will be entered” (see box 7 under AMENDMENTS on page 2 of the advisory action). However, Applicant is uncertain as to what proposed amendments the Examiner is referring to, insofar as in the final office action response of February 9, 2009, Applicant did not propose any amendments. In any case, then, there are no unentered claim amendments pending in the present patent application.

Summary of claimed subject matter

There are three independent claims, claims 1, 10, and 17, pending in the present patent application.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method for a raster image process (RIP) manager to automatically configure a RIP engine (method 200 of FIGs. 2 and 3; p. 14, ll. 7-8; para. [0040]). The method is operable in a networked computing environment including the RIP manager coupled to the RIP engine (environment 100 of FIG. 1, including RIP manager 102 and RIP engine 104; p. 4, ll. 9-11; para. [0014]; p. 5, ll. 3-5; para. [0016]). The method includes receiving a print job (part 202 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 11-12; para. [0040]). The method includes requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (part 208 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 15-21; paras. [0040]-[0041]; p. 6, ll. 23-25; p. 7, ll. 5-8; para. [0021]). The dynamic configuration is requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (p. 15, ll. 1-3).

Claim 10

Claim 10 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine stored thereon (p. 4, l. 19, through p. 5, l. 2; para. [0015]; RIP engine 104 of FIG. 1; p. 5, ll. 3-5; para. [0016]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for evaluating a print job to identify a set of RIPing parameters (p. 6, ll. 14-16; para. [0020]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for communicating the RIPing parameters to a RIP engine to direct the RIP engine to automatically configures its RIPing operations to conform to the RIPing parameters (part 208 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 15-17; para. [0040]; p. 6, l. 23, through p. 7, l. 8; para. [0021]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a supplied processing preference (part 208 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 15-21; paras. [0040]-[0041]; p. 6, ll. 23-25; p. 7, ll. 5-8; para. [0021]). The dynamic configuration is requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (p. 15, ll. 1-3).

Claim 17

Claim 17 is directed to a computer-readable medium comprising computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine coupled to a RIP manager (p. 4, l. 19, through p. 5, l. 2; para. [0015]; RIP manager 102 and RIP engine 104 of FIG. 1; p. 4, ll. 9-11; para. [0014]; p. 5, ll. 3-5; para. [0016]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for receiving, by the RIP engine, a request to configure RIPing operations in accordance with one or more parameters specified by the RIP manager (part 208 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 15-21; paras. [0040]-[0041]; p. 6, ll. 23-25; p. 7, ll. 5-8; para. [0021]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for responsive to receiving the request, the RIP engine configuring RIPing operations based on the one or more parameters (p. 7, ll. 5-8; para. [0021]). The computer-program instructions comprise instructions for requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter

when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a supplied processing preference (part 208 of FIG. 2; p. 14, ll. 15-21; paras. [0040]-[0041]; p. 6, ll. 23-25; p. 7, ll. 5-8; para. [0021]). The dynamic configuration is requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (p. 15, ll. 1-3).

Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal

For the purposes of this appeal, there is a total of three issues, or grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. The first ground of rejection is whether claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 16-18, and 22 have been properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit (5,619,624) in view of Neuhard (6,052,198). The second ground of rejection is whether claims 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 have been properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, and further in view of Berry (6,707,563). The third ground of rejection is whether claims 5 and 19-20 have been properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, and further in view of Eisele (2002/0109869).

Argument

First ground of rejection

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has erred in rejecting claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 16-18, and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10 and 17 at least as previously presented, are patentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard. As such, claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 16, 18, and 22 are patentable at least because they depend from patentable base independent claims.

The standard for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) is that the claimed invention is to be considered “as a whole” (MPEP sec. 2141.02.I.), taking into account all the claim language of the claim, and not just distilling the invention down to its “gist” or “thrust.” That is, “[d]istilling an invention down to the ‘gist’ or ‘thrust’ of an invention disregards the requirement of analyzing the subject matter ‘as a whole’” (MPEP sec 2141.02.II., citing *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). “*All words* in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art” (*Id.*, citing *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)).

Insofar as the rejection over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard is concerned, Applicant discusses claim 1 as representative of all the independent claims, because the other independent claims 10 and 17 at least substantially recite the limitation of claim 1 that Applicant submits is not suggested by Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard. In particular, claim 1 is limited to “requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processor preference.” Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is not suggested by Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard.

On page 3 of the office action of June 2, 2008, the Examiner indicated that Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard suggests this limitation insofar as elements 152, 156, 158, and 168 of FIG. 13 and column 13, lines 31-45 of Neuhard suggest this limitation. The Examiner interpreted these portions of Neuhard as suggesting that “after the print job is submitted, it gets checked whether the RIPPed version [of the print job] is submitted or available,” and if the RIPPed version of the

print job is not available, “the RIPPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer” (Office action of June 2, 2008, p. 3). Applicant agrees with the Examiner in this respect; that is, Neuhard does suggest that after a print job is submitted, it is determined whether a RIPPed version of the print job is available, and if a RIPPed version of the print job is unavailable, then a RIPPed version of the print job is generated and sent to the printer.

However, Neuhard in this respect does not rise to the level of Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard suggesting the limitation “requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPPING parameter when the RIPPING parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processor preference.” **First**, in Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, the RIP engine is requested to generate a RIPPed version of a print job – it is not requested to perform *dynamic configuration* of at least one RIPPING parameter, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. That is, in Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, there is no *configuration* being performed whatsoever. The online dictionary www.dictionary.com relevantly suggests that configuration means the way in which something is set up, where in the claimed invention we are configuring at least one parameter related to RIPPING. Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not perform any configuration of parameters related to RIPPING – rather, if a RIPPed version of a print job is unavailable, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard simply generates the RIPPed version of the print job (as opposed to, for instance, configuring the parameters related to RIPPING and that presumably control *how* the print job is RIPPed to generate to the RIPPed version thereof).

Second, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, there is no *parameter* suggested at all that can be considered to correspond to the invention’s RIPPING parameter. The online dictionary www.dictionary.com relevantly defines parameter as meaning a characteristic or factor, aspect, or element. Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not dynamically configure a characteristic/factor/aspect/element related to RIPPING the print job, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Rather, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard simply generates a RIPPed version of a print job if no RIPPed version of the print job is already available. Neither the print job nor the RIPPed version of the print job can be considered a *parameter* as most broadly and reasonably

interpreted by one of ordinary skill within the art (as suggested by the definition of this term by the online dictionary www.dictionary.com, as noted above).

Third, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not request *anything* to be performed *when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processor preference*, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. As noted above, there is no RIPing parameter suggested by Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard. As such, it cannot be said that Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard performs its functionality (i.e., generating a RIPPed version of a print job) when such a parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processor preference. Rather, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard performs its functionality (i.e., generating a RIPPed version of a print job) when a RIPPed version of the print job is unavailable – not when any type of parameter is not congruent to some type of preference, as in the claimed invention.

Fourth, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not suggest any type of *processor preference*, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. There are no preferences disclosed in Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, let alone *processor* preferences. The online dictionary www.dictionary.com relevantly defines preference as meaning a predisposition in favor of something. In Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, however, there is no predisposition in favor of something. Rather, if a print job has not yet been RIPPed to generate a RIPPed version of the job, then the RIPPed version of the job is available. This is not a *preference*, but rather is more of a demand – that is, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not *prefer* to generate a RIPPed version of a print job if the RIPPed version is unavailable, but rather *always* generates the RIPPed version of the print job if it is unavailable.

Fifth, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not suggest any type of preference that is *supplied by a RIP manager*, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. The Examiner has not indicated what component/element/etc. of Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard corresponds to the RIP manager recited in the claimed invention. Furthermore, Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard does not suggest any type of preference that is particularly *supplied* by such a RIP manager, unlike as in the claimed invention.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner in the final office action of December 8, 2008, in effect argued on pages 2-3 that generating a Ripped version of a print job reads on the limitation of performing dynamic configuration of at least one Ripping parameter. Therefore, the primary points of disagreement between the Examiner and Applicant are: (1) whether a *print job*, such as a Ripped version of a print job, can be considered a *parameter*; and, (2) whether *generating* a Ripped version of a print job can be considered *configuring*.

As to the first point of disagreement, Applicant respectfully submits that a print job or a Ripped version of a print job is not a parameter. As noted above, a *parameter* is relevantly defined as a *characteristic or factor, aspect, or element*. A Ripped version of a print job, or a print job, is not a characteristic, factor, aspect, or element, however. The Examiner has not disagreed with Applicant in this respect, but rather has argued that the definition of parameter implicitly suggested by reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed encompasses a print job (final office action of December 8, 2008, p. 2, para. 2).

Reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed provides examples of Ripping parameters by stating "E.g., print job and/or default values, download address, etc." It is important to consider the commas placed in this statement. By saying "print job and/or default values, download address, etc.," the term "print job" is not considered as a parameter itself, but rather is used as an adjective modifying the term "values," meaning that the values in question that can be parameters are "print job and/or default values" – i.e., print job values and/or default values. Thus, reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application does not suggest that a print job itself can be a parameter – which indeed, makes no sense in consideration of the definition of parameter noted in the previous paragraph.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is construing the statement associated with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed as meaning "E.g., print job[,] and/or default values, download addresses, etc." That is, the Examiner is implicitly inserting a command between "print job" and "and/or default values" in order to interpret the term parameter as meaning a print job. However, there is no comma between "print job" and "and/or default values" in the statement associated with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent

application. As such, the Examiner's interpretation is incorrect – the phrase “print job and/or default values, download addresses, etc.” means that parameters include one or both of two types of values – print job values and default values – as well as download addresses.

In this respect, Applicant notes the discussion on the Internet web page http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serial_comma that is relevant to this type of issue with commas. This web page notes the following example: “My favorite types of sandwiches are pastrami, ham, cream cheese and peanut butter and jelly.” If there is no comma between “cream cheese and “and peanut butter and jelly,” then there are three types of sandwiches: (1) pastrami; (2) ham; and, (3) cream cheese and peanut butter and jelly.” This is equivalent to the example parameters associated with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed, which states “print job and/or default values, download address, etc.,” and thus which means that there are three example types of parameters: (1) print job and/or default values (meaning print job values and/or default values, as discussed above); (2) download address; and, (3) “etc.”

By comparison, if there is a comma between “cream cheese” and “and peanut butter and jelly,” then there are four types of sandwiches in the sentence “My favorite types of sandwiches are pastrami, ham, cream cheese, and peanut butter and jelly”: (1) pastrami; (2) ham; (3) cream cheese; and, (4) peanut butter and jelly. This is what the Examiner is doing, inserting a comma between “print job” and “and/or default values.” Thus, if the example parameters associated with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed had stated “print job, and/or default values, download address, etc.,” then the Examiner would be correct, in that the example parameters expressed in the patent application would be: (1) print job; (2) default values; (3) download address; and, (4) “etc.” However, this is not what the patent application says: the patent application says that two example parameters are (1) *print job values* and/or (2) *default values*, not that the two example parameters are (1) *print job* and/or (2) *default values*.

The absence of a comma between “print job” and “and/or default values” is thus important to consider in correctly interpreting the phrase “print job and/or default values” in the list “print job and/or default values, download address, etc.” As discussed above, if you list sandwiches as “cream cheese and peanut butter and jelly, pastrami, etc.” then this means that there are three

types of sandwiches: (1) cream cheese and peanut butter and jelly; (2) pastrami; and, (3) “etc.” – and not four types: (1) cream cheese; (2) peanut butter and jelly; (3) pastrami; and, (4) “etc.” – because there is no comma between “cream cheese” and “and peanut butter and jelly.” Likewise, listing example parameters as “print job and/or default values, download address, etc.” means that there are three types of example parameters: (1) values, which may be print job values and/or default values; (2) download address; and, (3) “etc.” –and not four types (1) print job; (2) default values; (3) download address; and, (4) “etc.” – again, because there is no comma between “print job” and “and/or default values.”

Applicant presents the foregoing discussion to explain why the Examiner has interpreted the patent application incorrectly as to what a parameter is. Of course, however, the words and phrases presented in the patent application are not to be interpreted in a vacuum. The ordinary meaning of a term also has to be considered. (See, e.g., *Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1299, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1067 (Fed. Cir. 1999).) Besides the Examiner’s tortured interpretation of the patent application to encompass the phrase “print job” as a type of “parameter” – which is incorrect as noted above – Applicant notes that the Examiner has not provided any other example in which a “print job” can be considered a “parameter.” This makes sense, because a print job is not a parameter.

Indeed, consider this general definition of a parameter as used in computing like the claimed invention, as provided at the Internet web site [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parameter_\(computer_science\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parameter_(computer_science)): “In computer programming, a parameter is a variable that takes on the meaning of a corresponding argument passed in a call to a subroutine.” A print job value (i.e., a value specified by a given print job), a default value (i.e., a value that is the default value if a print job has not specified a value), and a download address, as noted in accordance with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 of the patent application as filed, are thus types of parameters. Consider the more thorough list of parameters described in the patent application as filed:

Such parameters include, for example, the ability to RIP a particular PDL type (i.e., the PDL used to express portions of the print job 112), use of a particular

RIPing algorithm (e.g., a specific halftoning technique, software version, etc.), a set of desired font characteristics required by the print job, press designations (generically as a press family type or as a specific individual press), ICC profiles (color management), and so on.

(P. 6, para. [0019].) Thus a parameter is a variable that takes on a meaning. The ability to RIP a particular PDL type is a parameter that can be set, for instance, to “yes” or “no.” Likewise, use of a particular RIPing algorithm is parameter that can be set, for instance, “algorithm one,” “algorithm two,” etc.

Note, however, how inconsistent and indeed incorrect it is to say that a *version of a print job that is to be generated* is a “parameter.” You can generate a version of a print job in accordance with one or more parameters – like those described in the patent application as filed as noted above – but the version of the print job that is itself generated is not a parameter. A print job is not “a variable that takes on the meaning of a corresponding argument passed in a call to a subroutine,” for instance. A print job is not a characteristic/factor/etc. In sum, then, to say that the prior art’s print job, or a version of the print job, corresponds to a parameter in the claimed invention is incorrect; the only way the Examiner has been able to correspond the former with the latter is by misinterpreting the patent application as filed by introducing a comma into the text associated with reference number 120 of FIG. 1 where no comma exists.

As to the second point of disagreement, as to whether *generating* a version of a print job can be considered *configuring* a parameter as in the claimed invention, Applicant notes that the term “configuration” means the way in which something is set up, as discussed above. By comparison, the online dictionary www.dictionary.com relevantly defines generation as meaning “the act or process of being generated,” where the term generate itself relevantly means to “create,” “to bring into existence,” or “to cause to be.” From these definitions, it is abundantly clear that *generating* something is not the same as *configuring* something.

For example, say I *configure*, or set up, a widget. This means that I set up the widget, which presumes that the widget already exists – because if the widget did not already exist, then there is no way I could set it up. By comparison, say I *generate*, or bring into existence, a widget. This means that I bring the widget into existence, which presumes that the widget did not already

exist – because if the widget did already exist, then it would be pointless to say that I am bring it into existence. Thus, you can first *generate* a widget, *and then configure* the widget – but the *generation* process is different than the *configuration* process. That is, generating a version of a print job, as in the prior art in combination, does not suggest configuring a parameter, as in the claimed invention. The act of generating is not the same as, and does not suggest, the act of configuring.

More specifically, as noted above, the prior art in combination suggests generating a Ripped version of a print job, whereas the claimed invention is limited to performing configuration of at least one Ripping parameter. As also noted above, a print job is not a Ripping parameter. Moreover, generating a Ripped version of a print job means that the Ripped version of the print job does not exist already, such that I am *creating* the Ripped version of the print job. By comparison, configuring a Ripping parameter implies that the Ripping parameter already exists (i.e., I am not *creating* the parameter); rather, I am providing this parameter with a specific meaning. For example, as noted above, an example parameter is the ability to RIP a particular PDL type, which can take on the value “yes” or “no.” As another example, a type of parameter is whether to use print job values (for other parameters) or default values (for these parameters), which can take on the value “use the values specified in the print job,” or the value “use the defaults values.” Configuring a parameter, in other words, is not the same as generating a Ripped version of a print job; insofar as the prior art suggests the latter, it does not suggest the former, to which the claimed invention is limited.

In summary, then, the prior art in combination does not rise to the level of suggesting configuration of a parameter, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Generation of a version of a print job, which the prior art in combination does suggest, is not the same as configuration of a parameter. First, a version of a print job is not a parameter. Second, generating is not the same as configuring. For all of these reasons discussed above, therefore, the invention is *prima facie* nonobvious and patentable over the cited prior art in combination.

Second ground of rejection

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has erred in rejecting claims 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, and further in view of Berry. Claims 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 are dependent claims, depending from the independent claims 1, 10 and 17. The error in the Examiner's rejection is that because claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentable, as discussed above, claims 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable base independent claim.

Third ground of rejection

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has erred in rejecting claims 5 and 19-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit in view of Neuhard, and further in view of Eisele. Claims 5 and 19-20 are dependent claims, depending from the independent claims 1 and 17. The error in the Examiner's rejection is that because This is because claims 1 and 17 are patentable, as discussed above, claims 5 and 19-20 are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable base independent claim.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

May 3, 2009
Date

Michael Dryja, Esq.
Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233

tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098

Claims appendix

1. (original) In a networked computing environment including a Raster Image Process (RIP) manager coupled to at least one RIP engine, a method for the RIP manager to automatically configure the RIP engine, the method comprising:

receiving a print job; and

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference, the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job.

2. (original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one RIPing parameter is a RIPing algorithm, a resource/software version, a particular font, or a color profile.

3. (previously presented) A method as recited in claim 1:

wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline;

wherein the first and second RIP engines are heterogeneous with respect to one another;

and

wherein requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration is further directed to configuring the first RIP engine to process the particular portion using same RIPing parameters as used by the second RIP engine to RIP a different portion of the print job.

4. (original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises downloading, by the RIP engine, any configuration resource(s) indicated by RIP manager supplied processing preference(s) that are not locally available to the RIP engine.

5. (original) A method as recited in claim 4, wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager.

6. (original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises:
directing the RIP engine to communicate a status to the RIP manager indicating whether the RIP engine can perform the dynamic configuration in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference; and
wherein the status determines whether the RIP engine or a different RIP engine in the pipeline will RIP the particular portion.
7. (original) A method as recited in claim 6, wherein the status is a response message or a lapse of time.
8. (original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises:
responsive to determining that the RIP engine cannot successfully RIP the print job in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference;
identifying a different RIP engine that can or has performed such dynamic configuration of the at least one RIPing parameter; and
communicating the particular portion to the different RIP engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference.
9. (original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises:
determining that the RIP engine can successfully RIP the print job in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference; and
responsive to the determining, communicating the particular portion to the RIP engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference.
10. (previously presented) A computer-readable medium having computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine stored thereon, the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

evaluating a print job to identify a set of RIPing parameters;
communicating the RIPing parameters to a RIP engine to direct the RIP engine to automatically configure its RIPing operations to conform to the RIPing parameters; and,
requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a supplied processing preference, the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job.

11. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the RIPing parameters indicate one or more specific RIPing algorithms, font resources, color profiles, and/or software versions.

12. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters.

13. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for:

receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters; and

responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations.

14. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for directing the RIP engine to RIP at least a portion of a print job using resource(s) associated with the RIPing parameters.

15. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline, and wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for:

determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters;

responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters; and

communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine.

16. (original) A raster image processor (RIP) manager computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-program instructions recited in claim 10.

17. (previously presented) A computer-readable medium comprising computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine coupled to a RIP manager, the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

receiving, by the RIP engine, a request to configure RIPing operations in accordance with one or more parameters specified by the RIP manager;

responsive to receiving the request, the RIP engine configuring RIPing operations based on the one or more parameters; and,

receiving by the RIP engine from the RIP manager a request to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIP parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference, the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job.

18. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the one or more parameters are associated with one or more of a particular RIPing algorithm, font resource, and/or software version.

19. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for downloading one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address.

20. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine.

21. (original) A computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for:

determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address; and

responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager.

22. (original) A computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17.

Evidence Appendix

(No evidence was submitted pursuant to Rules 130, 131, and 132, and therefore, this section is blank.)

Related Proceedings Appendix

(There are no related proceedings to this patent application, and therefore, this section is blank.)